arXiv:1702.06517v2 [math.AG] 22 Feb 2017

COLLECTIONS OF HYPERSURFACES CONTAINING A CURVE

DENNIS TSENG

Abstract. We consider the closed locus of r-tuples of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^r$ with positive dimensional intersection, and show in a large range of degrees that its largest component is the locus of r-tuples of hypersurfaces whose intersection contains a line. We then apply our methods to obtain new results on the largest components of the locus of hypersurfaces with positive dimensional singular loci and the locus of smooth hypersurfaces with a higher dimensional family of lines through a point than expected.

1. Introduction

A general choice of r hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^r$ will intersect at finitely many points. It is a closed condition for a sequence of hypersurfaces to not intersect properly, and the purpose of this paper is to address basic questions about this locus. A first natural question would be:

Problem 1.1. *Let $Z \subset \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{A}^{\binom{r+d_i}{d_i}}$ parameterize the k-tuples $(F_1, \ldots, F_k)$ of forms of degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_k$ that fail to intersect properly. What is the dimension of Z, and can one identify its largest component?*

One might naively expect that the largest component of Z is the locus of k-tuples of forms all containing a linear space of dimension $r-k+1$, because linear spaces are the simplest $r-k+1$ dimensional subvarieties of projective space, so a natural question is:

Problem 1.2. *Does the largest component of Z consist of tuples $(F_1, \ldots, F_k)$ containing a $r-k+1$ dimensional linear space?*

The answer to Problem 1.2 is negative as it stands. For example, if $r = 3$ and the degrees are $d_1 = 2$, $d_2 = 2$, and $d_3 = 100$, then the locus of 3-tuples of hypersurfaces all containing a line is codimension 103, while the second quadric will be equal to the first quadric in codimension 9. Even if the degrees are all equal, we can let $r = 4$, $k = 2$, and the degrees be $d_1 = 2$, $d_2 = 2$, where the two quadrics will contain a plane in codimension 16, but are equal in codimension 14.

In spite of this, our first result shows Problem 1.2 has a affirmative answer in a large range of cases when $k = r$:

Theorem 1.3. *If $2 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_r$ and $d_i \leq d_1 + \binom{d_1}{2}(i-1)$, then the locus $Z \subset \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{A}^{\binom{r+d_i}{d_i}}$ has codimension*

$$-2(r-1) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} (d_i + 1).$$

Furthermore, the unique component of largest dimension consists of r-tuples of hypersurfaces all containing a line.

Date: February 23, 2017.

Figure 1 depicts the restriction on the degrees in Theorem 1.3. See Theorem 4.6 for a slightly stronger and more general version of Theorem 1.3.



FIGURE 1.

1.1. **Applications.** We give two applications of our results. Consider the following conjecture studied by Slavov [15]

Conjecture 1.4. *Among hypersurfaces of degree ℓ in $\mathbb{P}^r$ with singular locus dimension at least b, the largest component consists of hypersurfaces singular along a b-dimensional linear space.*

As progress towards Conjecture 1.4, Slavov showed:

Theorem 1.5 ([15, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Given r, b, p, there exists an effectively computable integer $\ell_0 = \ell_0(r, b, p)$ such that for all $\ell \geq \ell_0$, Conjecture 1.4 holds over a field of characteristic p.*

Using our methods, we can give a much better bound for ℓ_0 in characteristic 0 when $b = 1$. A special case of Theorem 6.7 (to be proven in Section 6) is

Theorem 1.6. *In characteristic 0, if $\ell \geq 7$ or $\ell = 5$, among hypersurfaces with positive dimensional singular locus, the largest component is the locus of hypersurfaces singular along a line.*

The second application concerns lines on hypersurfaces, in particular, smooth hypersurfaces with unexpectedly large dimensions of lines through a given point. (These points are called *1-sharp* points in [14].) We would expect an $r - d - 1$ dimensional family of lines through a point on a smooth hypersurface of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^r$. The case $d \geq r$ is trivial, since we are not expecting any lines through a given point, the case $d \leq r - 2$ can be deduced from the crude degeneration given in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [9], and the case $d = r - 1$ and $r \leq 4$ can be analyzed directly. Therefore, the last open case is $d = r - 1$, $r \geq 5$, and we show:

Theorem 1.7. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{P}^{\binom{2r-1}{r-1}-1}$ be the open set of smooth hypersurfaces of degree $r - 1$ in $\mathbb{P}^r$ for $r \geq 5$. Let $Z \subset U$ be the closed subset of hypersurfaces X that contain a positive dimensional family of lines through a point. Then, the largest component of Z is the locus of hypersurfaces containing a 2-plane.*

For a more detailed description of what happens in all degrees and dimensions, see Theorem 5.1 below.

Lines through points on hypersurfaces are relevant to the following conjecture by Coskun, Harris, and Starr:

Conjecture 1.8 ([6, Conjecture 1.3])**.** *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a general Fano hypersurface of degree at least 3 and $R_e(X)$ denote the closure of the locus of the Hilbert scheme parameterizing smooth degree e rational curves on X. Then, $R_e(X)$ is irreducible of dimension $e(r+1-d)+r-4$.*

The general approach to Conjecture 1.8 has been to compactify the rational curves on X of degree e with the Kontsevich space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,0}(X, e)$ and apply a bend and break argument to reduce to the case of lower degree. This idea was first used by Harris-Roth-Starr to prove Conjecture 1.8 when $d < \frac{r+1}{2}$ [9] by reducing to the case of lines, and later improved to $d \leq \frac{2r+2}{3}$ by Behesti-Kumar [2] by reducing to the case of conics. In both papers, the restriction on the degree of the hypersurface was because rational curves have less moduli as the degree of the hypersurface increases, so bend and break no longer applies.

To overcome this problem, Riedl-Yang [14] proved Conjecture 1.8 for $d \leq r-2$ by applying bend and break to rational curves within a complete family of hypersurfaces to reduce to the case of lines, so it was crucial for them to know the codimension of the locus of hypersurfaces with more lines through points than expected. We hope that Theorem 1.7 will be useful in proving the $d = r-1$ case of Conjecture 1.8.

2. Key Example

The reader is encouraged to read the following example before the main argument because it will convey all of the main ideas. Throughout the example, we will be informal in our definitions and our justifications in the interest of clarity. We will work over $\mathbb{C}$, but any algebraically closed field will do. We consider the following case of our general problem:

Problem 2.1. *What is the dimension of 4-tuples of hypersurfaces of degrees 3, 4, 5 and 6 in $\mathbb{P}^4$ whose intersection contains a curve, and what is a description of the largest component?*

More precisely, let W_d be the vector space of homogenous degree d polynomials in $X_0, \ldots, X_4$. Define the closed subset $\Phi \subset W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$ to be the tuples (F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6) where F_i is of homogenous of degree i and F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 all contain a curve. Note that we are allowing the possibility that F_i can be chosen to be zero.

Since there are many types of curves that could be contained in $V(F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6)$, we set up the incidence correspondence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \widetilde{\Phi} & \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_1}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \pi_2} \\ \Phi & & \widetilde{\text{Hilb}} \end{array}$$

where $\widetilde{\text{Hilb}}$ is open subset of the Hilbert scheme of curves parameterizing integral curves, and $\widetilde{\Phi} \subset \Phi \times \widetilde{\text{Hilb}}$ is the locus of pairs $(F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6), [C]$ such that C is a curve contained in F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6.

Stated this way, we suspect the largest component of Φ is given by $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{lines}\}))$, the tuples (F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6) of hypersurfaces all containing a line. Comparing this with $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{conics}\}))$, we see that it is more conditions for a hypersurface to contain a fixed conic, but on the other hand conics have more moduli. It is possible to do the computation and see $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{lines}\}))$ has greater dimension than $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{conics}\}))$, but it isn't clear how to carry this out in general, as we would need to understand the relation between the dimension of a component of the Hilbert scheme and the Hilbert function of the curves it parameterizes.

Furthermore, there are curves that will not be in the intersection of F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 without an accompanying surface, in which case we also need to also account for the moduli of the curves on that surface. For instance, in our present example, we cannot have a degree 7 plane curve be contained in $F_3 \cap F_4 \cap F_5 \cap F_6$ without the 2-plane spanned by that curve also being in the intersection. In what follows, we will show that $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{lines}\}))$ is in fact the largest component of Φ in spite of the issues outlined above.

2.1. **Filtration by span.** We write $\Phi = \Phi(1) \cup \Phi(2) \cup \Phi(3) \cup \Phi(4)$, where $\Phi(i)$ is the locus where (F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6) all contain an integral curve C spanning an i-dimensional plane. Even though the sets $\Phi(i)$ are in general only constructible sets, it still makes sense to talk about their dimensions, for example by taking the dimension of their closures.

2.1.1. *Case of lines.* The set $\Phi(1)$ is by definition $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\{\text{lines}\}))$, or the locus where F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 all contain a line. It can be checked that the codimension of $\Phi(1)$ in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$ is

$$4 + 5 + 6 + 7 - \dim(\mathbb{G}(1, 4)) = 16.$$

2.1.2. *Case of nondegenerate curves.* Next, we look at $\Phi(4)$. Since we will need to keep track of more data in the following discussion, we let $\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4) := \Phi(4)$. Here, the subscripts are the degrees of the hypersurfaces F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 that are to be intersected, and the superscript shows that we are restricting to the case where F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 contain a curve that spans a 4-dimensional plane.

If $(F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6) \in \Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4)$, then in particular F_3, F_4, F_5 contain a nondegenerate integral curve. Under our new notation, this means forgetting the last hypersurface defines a map $\pi : \Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4) \to \Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4)$. Let $\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4) \subset \Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4)$ be the loci of (F_3, F_4, F_5) that all contain a nondegenerate integral surface.

Since

$$\dim(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4)) = \max\{\dim(\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))), \dim(\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)))\},$$

it suffices to bound $\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))$ and $\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))$ separately. Trivially,

$$\dim(\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))) \leq \dim(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)) + \dim(W_6).$$

To bound $\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))$, we need to bound the dimension of the fiber of

$$\pi : \pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)) \to \Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)$$

from below. Suppose $(F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6) \in \pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4) \backslash \Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))$. Then, $F_3 \cap F_4 \cap F_5$ contains no nondegenerate surfaces, but it does contain a nondegenerate curve C. We see that the number of conditions for F_6 to contain C set theoretically is at least $6 \cdot 4 + 1 = 25$, which is the Hilbert function of the rational normal curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$ evaluated at 6.

To summarize what we have so far, it is easier to use codimensions instead of dimensions. Let $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4))$ denote the codimension in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$. Similarly, $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4))$ and $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4))$ denote the codimension in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5$. So far, we have shown

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4)) &\geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)), \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(4)) + 25\} \\ &= \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)), 25\}.\end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same argument above for $\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)$, we see

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(4)) \geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{3-fold}}_{3,4}(4)), 51\},$$

where $51 = 2\binom{2+5-1}{5-1} + \binom{2+5}{5}$ is the Hilbert function of a minimal surface evaluated at 5. Continuing the process, we find

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{3-fold}}_{3,4}(4)) \geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{4-fold}}_{3}(4)), 55\}.$$

As a possible point of confusion, the number of conditions it is for a degree 4 hypersurface to contain a degree 3 hypersurface is $\binom{4+4}{4} - \binom{4+1}{1} = 65$, which is greater than 55. However, to keep our arguments consistent, we instead choose the weaker bound by the Hilbert function of a quadric hypersurface, which is also a variety of minimal degree. Finally,

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{4-fold}}_{3}(4)) = 35,$$

where $\Phi^{\text{4-fold}}_{3}(4)$ is just the single point in W_3 corresponding to the zero hypersurface. Putting everything together, we find

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi(4)) = \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(4)) \geq \min\{25, 51, 55, 35\} = 25.$$

2.1.3. *Case of curves spanning a 3-plane.* In order to bound the codimension of $\Phi(3)$ in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$, we use the same argument as we used to bound the codimension of $\Phi(4)$ with one small extra step. Consider the incidence correspondence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \widetilde{\Phi}(3) & \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_1}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \pi_2} \\ \Phi(3) & & \mathbb{G}(3,4) = (\mathbb{P}^4)^* \end{array}$$

where $\widetilde{\Phi}(3) \subset \Phi(3) \times (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ consists of pairs $(F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6), H$ where H is a hyperplane such that $F_3 \cap F_4 \cap F_5 \cap F_6$ contains an integral curve that spans H. To bound the codimension of $\Phi(3)$ from below, it suffices to bound the codimension of the fibers of π_2 in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$ from below.

By restricting F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6 to H, we see that the codimension of each fiber of π_2 is precisely the number of conditions for hypersurfaces of degrees (3,4,5,6) in $\mathbb{P}^3$ to contain a nondegenerate curve in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Writing this in symbols, the codimension of the fibers of π_2 is the codimension of $\Phi^{3,\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(3) \subset W_{3,3} \times W_{3,4} \times W_{3,5} \times W_{3,6}$, where $W_{r,d} \cong \mathbb{A}^{\binom{r+d}{d}}$ is the vector space of homogenous polynomials of degree d in $r+1$ variables, and $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(3)$ is the locus of hypersurfaces (F_3', F_4', F_5', F_6') containing a nondegenerate integral curve in $\mathbb{P}^3$. The extra superscript is to remind ourselves that we are working in $\mathbb{P}^3$ now.

Repeating the same argument as we did to bound $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi(4))$ above, we compute

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}_{3,4,5,6}(3)) \geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{surface}}_{3,4,5}(3)), 19 + \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}_{3,4,5}(3))\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4,5}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}(3)) &\geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{surface}}(3)), 16)\} \\
\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4,5}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{surface}}(3)) &\geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4}^{\mathbb{P}^3,3\text{-fold}}(3)), \operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{surface}}(3)) + 36\} \\
\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{surface}}(3)) &\geq \min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3}^{\mathbb{P}^3,3\text{-fold}}(3)), 25\} \\
\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4}^{\mathbb{P}^3,3\text{-fold}}(3)) &= \operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3}^{\mathbb{P}^3,3\text{-fold}}(3)) + 35 \\
\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3}^{\mathbb{P}^3,3\text{-fold}}(3)) &= 20.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we see

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4,5,6}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}(3)) \geq \min\{19+16, 19+25, 19+20, 36+25, 36+20, 35+20\} = 35$$

Finally, we conclude

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi(3)) \geq -\dim(\mathbb{G}(3,4)) + \operatorname{codim}(\Phi_{3,4,5,6}^{\mathbb{P}^3,\text{curve}}(3)) \geq 31.$$

2.1.4. *Case of plane curves.* The case of plane curves can be done directly since we can completely classify them. However, if we apply the same argument as above, the bound we get is $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi(2))$ is at least

$$-\dim(\mathbb{G}(2,4)) + \min\{13+11+9, 13+11+10, 13+15+10, 21+15+10\} = 27.$$

2.1.5. *Combining the cases.* Combining the cases, we get

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^1) = 16,\ \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^2) \geq 27,\ \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^3) \geq 31,\ \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^4) \geq 25.$$

Summarizing, we now know that the codimension of Φ in $W_3 \times W_4 \times W_5 \times W_6$ is exactly 16, the largest component of Φ corresponds to tuples of hypersurfaces all containing a line, and the second largest component has codimension at least 25.

3. General Argument

In this section, we aim to rigorously justify all the steps in Section 2, where the key components are Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4. The reader is encouraged to refer back to Section 2 frequently for motivation. We will work over an algebraically closed base field K of arbitrary characteristic. Unless otherwise stated, all constructions will be over K. Some basic lemmas will be proven in slightly more generality than needed, in order to better emphasize the key ingredients.

3.1. **Definitions.** Here, we fix the notation for the objects of study.

3.1.1. *Hilbert scheme and relative Hilbert scheme.* We won't use the geometry of the Hilbert scheme, but we will use its existance.

Definition 3.1. If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a projective scheme, let Hilb_X denote Hilbert scheme of subschemes of X. Let $\operatorname{Hilb}_X^c \subset \operatorname{Hilb}_X$ denote the connected components corresponding to subschemes of dimension c.

Definition 3.2. Let $\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X \subset \operatorname{Hilb}_X$ denote the subset of the Hilbert scheme corresponding to geometrically integral subschemes. Recall from 12.1.1 (x) in EGA IV [7], $\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}$ is open in Hilb. Let $\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X^b \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ correspond to subschemes of dimension b.

Definition 3.3. Suppose S is a finite type K-scheme and $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$ is a closed subscheme. Let $\mathrm{Hilb}_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ denote the relative Hilbert scheme of the family $\mathcal{X} \to S$. Similar to above, we let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathcal{X}/S} \subset \mathrm{Hilb}_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ denote the open locus parameterizing geometrically integral subschemes, and $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^b_{\mathcal{X}/S} \subset \mathrm{Hilb}^b_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ denote the restriction to b-dimensional subschemes.

3.1.2. *Constructible sets.* We will need to work with dimensions and maps of constructible sets.

Definition 3.4. If X is a scheme, then a constructible set $A \subset X$ is finite union of locally closed subsets.

To take the dimension of a constructible set, it suffices to either look at the generic points or take the closure.

Definition 3.5. If $A \subset X$ is a constructible set, then $\dim(A) := \dim(\overline{A})$.

By applying the usual theorem on fiber dimension to $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{B}$ below, we have:

Lemma 3.1. *If $f : X \to Y$ is a morphism of finite type schemes over a field, $A \subset X$ and $B \subset Y$ constructible sets, and $\dim(f^{-1}(b)) < c$ for all $c \in B$, then*

$$\dim(A) \leq \dim(B) + c.$$

If $\dim(f^{-1}(b)) = c$ for all $c \in B$, then equality holds.

For notational convenience, we define the pullback of a constructible set.

Definition 3.6. If $X \to Z \leftarrow Y$ are morphisms and $A \subset X$ is a constructible set, then define $A \times_Z Y$ to be the preimage of A in $X \times_Z Y$ under $X \times_Z Y \to X$.

3.1.3. *Locus of tuples of hypersurfaces not intersecting properly.* In order to parameterize the space of hypersurfaces, we choose to use affine spaces. This has the advantage of both restricting well to subvarieties and the interpretation of being sections of line bundles. The zero hypersurface is always a point in our space of hypersurfaces.

Definition 3.7. Given positive integers r, d, let $W_{r,d} \cong \mathbb{A}^{\binom{r+d}{d}}$ be the affine space whose underlying vector space is $H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(d))$, the hypersurfaces of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^r$.

Definition 3.8. Over $W_{r,d}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{r,d} \subset \mathbb{P}^r \times W_{r,d}$ be the universal family $\mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to W_{r,d}$.

In the Definition 3.9 it is useful to keep in mind that, even though we are mostly interested in the case of hypersurfaces failing to be a complete intersection $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r)$, we will need to let X and a vary.

Definition 3.9. If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a projective scheme, a a nonnegative integer, and $(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ is a tuple of positive integers, define $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X) \subset \prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$ to be the closed subset of tuples $(F_1, \ldots, F_k)$ of hypersurfaces of degrees $(d_1 \ldots, d_k)$ such that

$$\dim(X \cap F_1 \cap \cdots \cap F_k) \geq \dim(X) - k + a.$$

If L is a field other than K and $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r_L$, we similarly define $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_L,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X)$.

In particular, $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,0}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$ is all of $\prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is the locus of hypersurfaces failing to be a complete intersection. Similarly, given a family $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$, we can define a relative version.

Definition 3.10. Given a finite type K-scheme S and a closed subscheme $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$, let $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S) \subset S \times_K \prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$ denote the closed subset such that for all $s \in S$ with residue field $k(s)$, then the fiber of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S) \to S$ over s is $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_{k(s)},a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}|_s)$.

Both $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$ and $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S)$ can be constructed by applying upper semicontinuity of dimension to the respective families over $\prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$ and $S \times \prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$.

3.2. **Incidence correspondence.** We will want to break up $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ into constructible sets based on the types of schemes contained in the hypersurfaces. To formalize this, we define the following.

Definition 3.11. Given $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ a projective scheme, let $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X) \subset \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X) \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a}$ denote the closed subset corresponding to pairs $(F_1,\dots,F_k),[V]$, where $(F_1,\dots,F_k) \in \prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$ and $[V] \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\dim(X)-k+a}$ such that $V \subset X \cap F_1 \cap \cdots \cap F_k$.

If L is a field other than K and $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r_L$, we can similarly define $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_L,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$.

Similarly, we have the relative version.

Definition 3.12. Given a finite type K-scheme S and a subscheme $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$ where each fiber of $\mathcal{X}/S$ has the same dimension b, let $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S) \subset \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S) \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^{b-k+a}_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ denote the closed subset such that, for each $s \in S$ with residue field $k(s)$, the restriction of $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S) \to S$ to the fiber over s is $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_{k(s)},a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}|_s)$.

To construct both $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$ and $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S)$, we can use:

Lemma 3.2 ([1, Lemma 7.1])**.** *Given a scheme A and two closed subschemes $B, C \subset \mathbb{P}^r_A$ with B flat over A, there exists a closed subscheme $D \subset A$ such that any morphism $T \to A$ factors through D if and only if $B \times_A T$ is a subscheme of $C \times_A T$.*

In particular, $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$ and $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S)$ actually have a canonical scheme theoretic structure, though we will not make use of it.

To find the largest component of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r)$, our general plan is to cover $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^{r-k+1}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ with constructible sets A_i, and bound the dimensions of $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(A_i))$ for each i, where π_1 and π_2 are given by the following diagram in the case $X = \mathbb{P}^r$ and $a = 1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X) & \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_1}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \pi_2} \\ \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X) & & \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a} \end{array}$$

This isn't a serious issue, but we would like to restrict ourselves to finitely many connected components of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a}$. Otherwise, for example, if we take the subset $A \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a}$ of nondegenerate varieties, then $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(A))$ is a priori only a countable union of constructible sets obtained by applying Chevalley's theorem to A restricted to each connected component of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a}$.

Therefore, we define

Definition 3.13. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{c,\leq D} \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{c}$ denote the connected components parameterizing subschemes of degree at most D. We similarly define $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathcal{X}/S}^{c,\leq D} \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathcal{X}/S}^{c}$ for $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$.

From Chow's finiteness theorem, for example from Exercise 3.28 and Theorems 6.3 in [10], we see $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{c,\leq D}$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathcal{X}/S}^{c,\leq D}$ have only finitely many connected components. From refined Bezout's theorem (Example 12.3.1 in [8]), we see that for $D = d_1 \cdots d_k$ that $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a,\leq D}))$ is all of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X)$. In general, we will always choose D such that $D \geq d_1 \cdots d_k$.

Remark 1. *The application of Chow's finiteness theorem and refined Bezout's theorem are unnecessary and entirely for notational convenience. Very generally, given any finite dimensional Noetherian scheme S covered by a family of constructible sets, there will exist a finite subcover by looking at the generic points of S and applying induction on dimension. Applying this to $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X)$ shows that there is a union A of finitely many connected components of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}^{r-k+1}$ such that $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(A)) = \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X)$, so we can just restrict our incidence correspondence to A instead of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a,\leq D}$.*

Motivated from above, we make the following definition.

Definition 3.14. For $A \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ a constructible subset and $D \geq d_1 \cdots d_k$, let $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X, A) = \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(A \cap \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a,\leq D}))$.

Similarly, we have the relative version.

Definition 3.15. Let S be a finite type K-scheme, $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^r_S$ a family such that $\mathcal{X} \to S$ has b-dimensional fibers, $\mathcal{A} \subset S \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ a constructible subset. For $D \geq d_1 \cdots d_k$, let $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S, \mathcal{A}) = \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\mathcal{A} \cap \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathcal{X}/S}^{b-k+a,\leq D}))$ for π_1 and π_2 defined as below.



3.3. **Inducting on number of hypersurfaces.** We present Lemma 3.3 which bounds the dimension of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(X, A)$.

3.3.1. *Preliminary definitions.* Instead of working with dimensions, it is easier to work with codimensions.

Definition 3.16. Let $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X))$ and $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X,A))$ be the codimension in $\prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$. We similarly let $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S))$ and $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S,\mathcal{A}))$ mean the codimension in $S\times\prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i}$.

We will need to refer to the minimum of the Hilbert function over a constructible set of the Hilbert scheme.

Definition 3.17. For $A\subset\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ a constructible set, let

$$h_A(d):=\min\{h_Z(d):[Z]\in A\}.$$

We will need notation to refer to varieties containing a piece of the Hilbert scheme.

Definition 3.18. Given $A\subset\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ a constructible subset with finitely many connected components, let $\operatorname{Contain}(A)$ denote the constructible subset consisting of all $[Y]\in\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ such that Y contains some Z for $[Z]\in A$.

To see $\operatorname{Contain}(A)$ is constructible, let $\mathcal{Z}\subset\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X\times\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ denote the subset corresponding to pairs $[Y],[Z]$ such that $Z\subset Y$. Lemma 3.2 shows $\mathcal{Z}$ is closed. From the incidence correspondence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Z} & \\ {\scriptstyle\pi_1}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle\pi_2} \\ \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X & & \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X \end{array}$$

we see $\operatorname{Contain}(A)=\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(A))$ is constructible by Chevalley's theorem. It is at this stage that we use that A has finitely many connected components.

3.3.2. *Forgetting a hypersurface.*

Lemma 3.3. *For $X\subset\mathbb{P}^r$ a projective scheme and $A\subset\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a,\le D}$ constructible,*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X,A))\ge\min\{\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1)),\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_2))+h_A(d_k)\},$$

where $A_1=\operatorname{Contain}(A)\cap\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a+1,\le D}$ and $A_2=\operatorname{Contain}(A)\cap\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X^{\dim(X)-k+a,\le D}$.

Proof. Let the constructible set B be the image of the projection $\pi:\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X,A)\to\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}W_{r,d_i}$ forgetting the last hypersurface. By definition, we see $B\subset\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1)\cup\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_2)$.

Lemma 3.1 shows

$$\operatorname{codim}(\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1))\ge\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1)).$$

To bound $\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_2)\backslash\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1))$, let

$$(F_1,\dots,F_{k-1})\in\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_2)\backslash\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X,A_1)$$

be a closed point and $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$ be the $\dim(X) - k + a$ dimensional components of $X \cap F_1 \cap \cdots \cap F_{k-1}$ that are set-theoretically contained in Z for $[Z] \in A$ a closed point. Here, we are using $(F_1, \dots, F_{k-1}) \notin \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_1)$ so that $X \cap F_1 \cap \cdots \cap F_{k-1}$ does not contain any component V of dimension greater than $\dim(X) - k + a$ containing Z for $[Z] \in A$.

The locus of F_k that contain V_i is a plane in W_{r,d_k} of codimension $h_{V_i}(d_k)$. Therefore, the codimension of $\pi^{-1}(p)$ in W_{r,d_k} is at least $h_A(d_k)$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{codim}(\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_2) \backslash \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_1))) \geq \\ \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_2) \backslash \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_1)) + h_A(d_k) \geq \\ \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_2)) + h_A(d_k).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2. *This issue is well-disguised in the proof, but, if our base field K is not algebraically closed, then we need to take geometric points instead of closed points when bounding $\pi^{-1}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_2) \backslash \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_1))$. The issue is that, if*

$$p \in \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a-1}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_2) \backslash \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_{k-1}}(X, A_1)$$

has residue field $k(p)$, then we cannot determine $B \times_K k(p)$ by just taking $k(p)$-points, as $X_{k(p)} \cap F_1 \cap \cdots F_{k-1}$ might geometric components not defined over $k(p)$. However, since $B \times_K \overline{k(p)}$ is over an algebraically closed field, knowing the $\overline{k(p)}$-points is a union of planes is enough to determine $B \times_K \overline{k(p)}$ topologically.

3.4. **Varieties contained in a family.** When a constructible set $A \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}_X$ consists of varieties $[Z] \in A$ that are contained in a family of smaller dimensional varieties, it is sometimes possible to set up an incidence correspondence to obtain better bounds than Lemma 3.3. Lemma 3.4 seems notationally heavy, but, in the case of the Key Example in Section 2, it really is just the incidence correspondence at the beginning of section 2.1.3.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose S is a finite type K-scheme, $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r_K$ is a projective scheme, $\mathcal{X} \subset X \times_K S$ is a closed subscheme such that each fiber of $\mathcal{X} \to S$ has codimension e in X, $\mathcal{A} \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-k+a,\leq D}_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ is a constructible subset, the image of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-b+a}_X$ under $\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-k+a}_{\mathcal{X}/S} \to \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-b+a}_X$ is A, and the fiber dimension $\mathcal{A} \to A$ is at least c for all points in A. Then,*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X, A)) \geq \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a+e}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S, \mathcal{A})) - \dim(S) + c,$$

and equality holds if the fiber dimension of $\mathcal{A} \to A$ is exactly c for all points of A and $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X, A) \to \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X, A)$ has finite fibers.

Proof. To summarize all the objects involved, consider the commutative diagram



Restricting to $\mathcal{A}$ yields



To show the inequality, it suffices to show that ϕ_1 has fiber dimension at least c. To see this, take a closed point $(F_1,\dots,F_k) \in \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X)$. Let $B := \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-k+a}_{F_1\cap\cdots\cap F_k\cap X} \cap A \subset A$ be the constructible set of all $[Z] \in A$ such that $Z \subset X \cap F_1 \cap \cdots \cap F_k$. The fiber of ϕ_1 over $(F_1,\dots,F_k)$ is $\bigcup_{a\in B}\phi_3^{-1}(a)$, which has dimension at least c, since each fiber of ϕ_3 has dimension at least c.

For the equality case, we note $\widetilde{\pi}_1$, π_1 and ϕ_3 are surjective by definition. The maps $\widetilde{\pi}_2$ and π_2 are surjections since the affine spaces W_{r,d_i} contain the zero hypersurface. The map ϕ_2 is surjective because the fiber of ϕ_2 over a pair $(F_1,\dots,F_k),[Z]$ corresponding to a closed point of $\prod_{i=1}^k W_{r,d_i} \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^{\dim(X)-k+a}_{X}$ is $\phi_3^{-1}([Z])$, and ϕ_1 is surjective because each fiber of ϕ_1 is a union of fibers of ϕ_2 as above.

To see the equality case, we note that B is finite if π_1 is finite, so $\bigcup_{a\in B}\phi_3^{-1}(a)$ has dimension exactly c if $\phi_3^{-1}(a)$ has dimension exactly c for all $a \in B$. □

4. Partitioning by Span

In order to apply Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we need to partition $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ into constructible sets. We will partition by span.

Definition 4.1. Given a positive integer b, let $\mathrm{Span}(r,b) \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ denote the locally closed subset parameterizing geometrically integral schemes $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ where Z spans a plane of dimension b.

To see $\mathrm{Span}(r,b)$ is locally closed, we note that $\bigcup_{i=0}^b \mathrm{Span}(r,i)$ is closed because we can apply upper semicontinuity of dimension to see the locus $\mathcal{Z} \subset \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r} \times \mathbb{G}(b,r)$ of pairs $[Z],P$ with $Z \subset P$ is closed and then project $\mathcal{Z}$ to $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}_{\mathbb{P}^r}$. Also, it is easy to see

Lemma 4.1. *We have* $\mathrm{Contain}(\mathrm{Span}(r,r)) = \mathrm{Span}(r,r)$.

Next, we recall that among all nondegenerate integral schemes in projective space, the Hilbert function can be bounded below by the Hilbert function of a variety of minimal degree. This is stated in Theorem 4.5 in [12] for example.

Lemma 4.2. *We have*

$$h_{\mathrm{Span}(r,r)\cap \mathrm{Hilb}^a_{\mathbb{P}^r}}(d) = (r-a)\binom{d+a-1}{d-1} + \binom{d+a}{d}.$$

Definition 4.2. Define

$$h_{r,a}(d) := (r-a)\binom{d+a-1}{d-1} + \binom{d+a}{d}.$$

By iterating Lemma 3.3 and applying Lemma 4.2, we get

Lemma 4.3. *We have* $\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X,\mathrm{Span}(r,r)))$ *is at least*

$$\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{a} h_{r,r-i_j+j}(d_{i_j}) : S=\{i_1,i_2,\cdots,i_a\}\subset\{1,\dots,k\}, i_1<\cdots<i_a\}.$$

The bound in Lemma 4.3 depends on the order of the d_i's and it is better to order them so $d_1 \le d_2 \le \cdots \le d_k$. We could have similarly bounded $\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X,\mathrm{Span}(r,b)))$, but this is better dealt with using Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r,\mathrm{Span}(r,b))) \ge \mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^b,a+(r-b)}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^b,\mathrm{Span}(b,b))) - \dim(\mathbb{G}(b,r)),$$

and equality holds when $b=a$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 3.4 in the case $S=\mathbb{G}(b,r)$, $\mathcal{X}$ is the universal family of b-planes over the Grassmannian, $\mathcal{A}$ is $(\mathrm{Span}(r,b)\times_K S)\cap \widetilde{\mathrm{Hilb}}^{b-k+a,\le D}_{\mathcal{X}/S}$, $Y=\mathbb{P}^r$, and $c=0$ to get

$$\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r,\mathrm{Span}(r,b))) \ge \mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a+(r-b)}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S,\mathcal{A})) - \dim(\mathbb{G}(b,r)).$$

Let $P\subset\mathbb{P}^r_K$ correspond to a closed point of $s\in S$. Then, the fiber of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r_S,a+(r-b)}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathcal{X}/S,\mathcal{A})\to S$ over s is isomorphic to

$$\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^b,a+(r-b)}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^b,\mathrm{Span}(b,b))\times\prod_{i=1}^{k} W_{r,d_i}/W_{b,d_i}$$

by restricting to $P\cong\mathbb{P}^b$.

We now show equality holds when $b=a$. It suffices to show

$$\widetilde{\Phi}^{r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r,\mathrm{Span}(r,b)) \to \Phi^{r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r,\mathrm{Span}(r,b))$$

has finite fibers. Therefore, it suffices to show there exists a choice of $(F_1,\dots,F_k)$ of hypersurfaces such that $F_1,\dots,F_k$ contains some $r-k+a$ dimensional plane P and $(F_1,\dots,F_{k-a})$ is a complete intersection. Then, $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k-a}F_i$ cannot contain a positive dimensional family of $r-k+a$ planes, so $c=0$.

We will construct $(F_1,\dots,F_{k-a})$ inductively. Fix a $r-k+a$ dimensional plane P, and suppose we have found $F_1,\dots,F_i$ containing P such that $(F_1,\dots,F_i)$ is a complete intersection for $1\le i<k-a$. Let the components of $F_1\cap\cdots\cap F_i$ be $X_1,\dots,X_\ell$. We want to find a

hypersurface F_{i+1} that contains P but not X_j for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$. Let $V_j \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(d_{i+1}))$ be the vector space of degree d_{i+1} forms vanishing on X_j and let $V \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(d_{i+1}))$ be the vector space of degree d_{i+1} forms vanishing on P.

Let h denote the Hilbert function. Since $\dim(X_j) > \dim(P)$ and P is a plane, $h_P(d_{i+1}) < h_{X_j}(d_{i+1})$, so the inclusion $V_j \subset V$ is strict. Therefore, $V \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} V_j$ is nonempty, and we can pick any F_{i+1} in $V \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} V_j$. Finally, we pick $F_{k-a+1}, \ldots, F_k$ to be any hypersurfaces containing P. □

Definition 4.3. Given r, a and degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_k$, let

$$F_{r,a}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) := \min\{\sum_{j=1}^{a} h_{r,r-i_j+j}(d_{i_j}) : S = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_a\} \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}, i_1 < \cdots < i_a\}$$

Definition 4.4. Given r, a, degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_k$ and $r - k + a \leq b \leq r$, let

$$G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) := F_{b,a+(r-b)}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) - \dim(\mathbb{G}(b, r)).$$

Combining Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, we have

Theorem 4.5. *For $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_k$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r-k+a))) &= G_{r,a,r-k+a}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \\ &= -(r-k+a+1)(k-a) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \binom{d_i + r - k + a}{r - k + a}.\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r-k+a))) \geq \min_{b=r-k+a+1}^{r} G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$$

Remark 3. *The key example in Section 2 outlines in detail the argument that goes into the proof of Theorem 4.5.*

4.1. **Hypersurfaces containing a curve.** We specialize Theorem 4.5 to the case of hypersurfaces containing a curve in order to get cleaner results. At this point, we have reduced our problem to combinatorics.

What really matters in our case is not the exact codimension, but the difference between the codimension of hypersurfaces all containing a line, and the codimension of hypersurfaces containing curves with higher dimensional spans.

Definition 4.5. Let $H_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) := G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) - G_{r,a,r-k+a}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$.

Our goal is to prove

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose $r - k + a = 1$ and $2 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_k$. Then, if $d_i \leq d_1 + (i-1)\binom{d_1}{2}$, then*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus \Phi^{r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r-k+a))) - \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{r,a}_{d_1,\ldots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r))$$

is at least

$$\begin{cases} r-1 & \text{if } k = r \\ r - 1 + (d-2)(r-2) + d(k-r) & \text{if } k > r. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Most of the work is done in Lemma 4.9 below. From Lemma 4.9, it suffices to consider the case $d_1 = \cdots = d_k = d$. Then, we see

$$G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) = -\dim(\mathbb{G}(b, r)) + (a + (r - b))(db + 1).$$

This is a quadratic in b with leading coefficient $1 - d < 0$, so it suffices to show

$$\begin{matrix} H_{r,a,2}(d_1, \ldots, d_k), \\ H_{r,a,r}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \end{matrix} \geq \begin{cases} r - 1 & \text{if } k = r \\ r - 1 + (d-2)(r-2) + d(k-r) & \text{if } k > r. \end{cases}$$

We see

$$\begin{aligned} H_{r,a,2}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) &= -3(r-2) + (k-1)(2d+1) - k(d+1) + 2(r-1) \\ &= d(k-2) - r + 3 = r - 1 + d(k-2) - (2r-4) \\ &= r - 1 + (d-2)(r-2) + d(k-r). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{r,a,r}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) &= (k - r + 1)(rd + 1) - k(d+1) + 2(r-1) \\ &= d(kr - k - r^2 + r) + r - 1 = d(k-r)(r-1) + (r-1). \end{aligned}$$

To finish, we need to check $H_{r,a,2}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \geq H_{r,a,r}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ for $k = r$ but $H_{r,a,2}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \leq H_{r,a,r}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ for $k > r$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} H_{r,a,r}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) - H_{r,a,2}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) &= d(k-r)(r-2) - (d-2)(r-2) \\ &= (r-2)(d(k-r) - (d-2)), \end{aligned}$$

and $d(k-r) - (d-2)$ is positive if $k > r$ and negative if $k = r$. □

The reason why applying Theorem 4.5 is not completely straightforward is because the definition of $F_{r,a}$ requires us to take a minimum over a large choice of indices.

Definition 4.6. We say that the minimum for $F_{r,a}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ is achieved at $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_a \leq k$ if

$$F_{r,a}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{a} h_{r,r-i_j+j}(d_{i_j})$$

Note that the choice of $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ is not necessarily unique.

Definition 4.7. Similarly, we say that the minimum for $G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ is achieved at $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{a+r-b} \leq k$ if the minimum for $F_{b,a+(r-b)}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ is achieved at $i_1 < \cdots < i_{a+r-b}$.

From directly computing, we have the following easy facts.

Lemma 4.7. *We have*

$$h_{r,a}(d) - h_{r,a}(d-1) = (r-a)\binom{d+a-2}{d-1} + \binom{d+a-1}{d}.$$

Lemma 4.8. *We have*

$$h_{r,a+1}(d) - h_{r,a}(d) = (r-a)\binom{d+a-1}{a+1}.$$

Lemma 4.9 is the key combinatorial lemma in this section.

Lemma 4.9. *For $r-k+a=1$ and*

$$\min\{H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k):\ d=d_1\le d_2\le\cdots\le d_k, d_i\le d+(i-1)\binom{d}{2}\}=H_{r,a,b}(d,\dots,d)$$

Proof. Suppose we are given $d=d_1\le d_2\le\cdots\le d_k$. We want to show

$$H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)\ge H_{r,a,b}(d,\dots,d).$$

We will use induction on $d_1+\cdots+d_k$. Therefore it suffices to find $d_1',\dots,d_k'$ with $d_1'+\cdots+d_k'<d_1+\cdots+d_k$ such that $H_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')\le H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)$. The proof is structured like an induction, but perhaps it is intuitively easier to think of it as taking $(d_1,\dots,d_k)$, and altering the degrees bit by bit until they reach $(d,\dots,d)$, while all the time not increasing the value of $H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)$.

Suppose the minimum of $G_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)$ is achieved at $i_1<\cdots<i_{a-r+b}$. Suppose $d_{i_1}>d$. Define

$$d_i'=\begin{cases}\max\{d,d_i-1\} & \text{if } i\le i_1\\ d_i & \text{if } i>i_1.\end{cases}$$

We claim that $H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)\ge H_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')$. To see this,

$$\begin{aligned}&H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)-H_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')=\\ &G_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)-G_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')-G_{r,a,1}(d_1,\dots,d_k)+G_{r,a,1}(d_1',\dots,d_k')\ge\\ &h_{b,b-i_1+1}(d_{i_1})-h_{b,b-i_1+1}(d_{i_1}-1)-i_1\ge\\ &(i_1-1)\binom{d_{i_1}+b-i_i-1}{d_{i_1}-1}+\binom{d_{i_1}+b-i_i}{d_{i_1}}-i_1,\end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 4.7 in the last step. Since $r-k+a=1$, $i_1\le b$. Therefore, we see the quantity above is at least $(i_1-1)+1-i_1=0$. Therefore, if $d_{i_1}>d$, we are done by induction. Otherwise, we can assume $d=d_1=\cdots=d_{i_1}$.

Suppose j is the minimum index for which $i_j-i_{j-1}>1$. If there is no such index, let $j=a+r-b+1$. First, we reduce to the case where $d_{i_1}=\cdots=d_{i_{j-1}}=d$. Let $1\le\ell<j$ be the minimum index such that $d_{i_\ell}>d$. We can use the same trick as before. If we again define

$$d_i'=\begin{cases}d & \text{if } i<i_\ell\\ d_{i_\ell}-1 & \text{if } i=i_\ell\\ d_i & \text{if } i>i_\ell,\end{cases}$$

then we again see that $H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)\ge H_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')$, as

$$\begin{aligned}&H_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)-H_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')=\\ &G_{r,a,b}(d_1,\dots,d_k)-G_{r,a,b}(d_1',\dots,d_k')-G_{r,a,1}(d_1,\dots,d_k)+G_{r,a,1}(d_1',\dots,d_k')\ge\\ &h_{b,b-i_\ell+\ell}(d_{i_\ell})-h_{b,b-i_\ell+\ell}(d_{i_\ell}-1)-1=\\ &(i_\ell-\ell)\binom{d_{i_\ell}+b-i_\ell+\ell-2}{d_{i_\ell}-1}+\binom{d_{i_\ell}+b-i_\ell+\ell-1}{d_{i_\ell}}-1\ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

Again, we are using $i_\ell-\ell\le b-1$. Therefore, we see that if $d_{i_\ell}>d$, then we are done by induction. Otherwise, we can now assume $d_{i_1}=\cdots=d_{i_{j-1}}=d$. Recall from above, we also have by assumption that $d_i=d$ for $i\le i_{j-1}$, $i_2=i_1+1,\dots,i_{j-1}=i_{j-2}+1$.

If $i_1 = b$, then $i_1, \ldots, i_{a+(r-b)}$ is precisely $b, \ldots, k$, so $d_i = d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, in which case we are done. Therefore, we can assume $i_1 < b$.

Suppose $i_1 < b$, so in particular $j \leq a$ and $i_j > i_{j-1} + 1$. Note $d_{i_{j-1}+1} > d$, because otherwise replacing i_{j-1} by $i_{j-1}+1$ would decrease $\sum_{\ell=1}^{a+(r-b)} h_{b,r-i_\ell+\ell}(d_{i_\ell})$, contradicting the assumption that the minimum of $G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ is achieved at $i_1 < \cdots < i_{a+(r-b)}$. Let

$$d'_i = \begin{cases} d & \text{if } i \leq i_{j-1} + 1 \\ d_i & \text{if } i > i_{j-1} + 1. \end{cases}$$

We claim $H_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \geq H_{r,a,b}(d'_1, \ldots, d'_k)$. To see this, let

$$i'_\ell = \begin{cases} i_\ell + 1 & \text{if } \ell < j \\ i_\ell & \text{if } \ell \geq j \end{cases}$$

we see

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) - H_{r,a,b}(d'_1, \ldots, d'_k) = \\ &G_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) - G_{r,a,b}(d'_1, \ldots, d'_k) - G_{r,a,1}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) + G_{r,a,1}(d'_1, \ldots, d'_k) \geq \\ &\sum_{\ell=1}^{a+(r-b)} h_{b,r-i_\ell+\ell}(d_{i_\ell}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{a+(r-b)} h_{b,r-i'_\ell+\ell}(d'_{i_\ell}) - (d_{i_{j-1}+1} - d) \geq \\ &(j-1)(h_{b,b-i_1+1}(d) - h_{b,b-i_1}(d)) - \binom{d}{2} i_{j-1} = \\ &(j-1) i_1 \binom{d+b-i_1-1}{b-i_1+1} - \binom{d}{2}(i_1 + j - 2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $i_1 < b$, we know $b - i_1 \geq 1$. So, this is at least

$$(j-1) i_1 \binom{d}{2} - \binom{d}{2}(i_1 + j - 2) = \binom{d}{2}((j-1)i_1 - (i_1 + j - 2)).$$

Since $i_1 \geq 1$ and $j > 1$, we see $(j-1)i_1 - (i_1 + j - 2) \geq 0$. Therefore, we see $H_{r,a,b}(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \geq H_{r,a,b}(d'_1, \ldots, d'_k)$, so we are again done by induction. □

5. Application: Lines in a hypersurface through a point

Let $\mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to W_{r,d}$ be the universal hypersurface. Let $F_1(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d})$ denote the lines on the universal hypersurface. More precisely, it is the relative Hilbert scheme of lines in the family $\mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to W_{r,d}$. The universal family over $F_1(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d})$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $F_{0,1}(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d}) \to F_1(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d})$ corresponding to a choice of a line and a point on that line.

There is an evaluation map $F_{0,1}(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d}) \to \mathcal{F}_{r,d}$, and the expected fiber dimension is $r - 1 - d$. We are interested in when the fiber dimension jumps. In the statement of Theorem 5.1 below, we will need to refer to *Eckardt points*.

Definition 5.1. If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a smooth projective variety, then $x \in X$ is an *Eckardt point* of X if the second fundamental form at $x \in X$ vanishes.

In the notation of [5], these are 0-Eckardt points. More concretely, if we let X be cut out by the homogenous polynomial F of degree d, let x be the origin in an affine chart, and expand F around x as $F = F_1 + \cdots + F_d$, where F_i is the degree i part of F after dehomogenization, then x is an Eckardt point if and only if F_1 divides F_2.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $U \subset W_{r,d}$ be the open subset of smooth hypersurfaces of degree $d \geq 3$ in $\mathbb{P}^r$ for $r \geq 2$. Let $Z \subset U$ be the closed subset of hypersurfaces X for which the evaluation map $F_{0,1}(X) \to X$ has a fiber of dimension greater than $r-1-d$. Then, the largest component of Z consists of*

(1) the hypersurfaces with an Eckardt point for $d \leq r-2$ or $d = r-1$ and $r \leq 5$
(2) the hypersurfaces containing a 2-plane for $d = r-1$ and $r \geq 5$
(3) the hypersurfaces containing a line for $d \geq r$.

Furthermore if $d = 4$ and $r = 5$, Z has exactly two components of maximal dimension corresponding to cases (1) and (2). In all other cases, the component of maximal dimension is unique.

Proof. If we let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{F}_{r,d}$ be the locus where the fiber of $F_{0,1}(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d}) \to F_{r,d}$ has fiber dimension greater than $r-1$ and $\pi : \mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to W_{r,d}$ be the projection, then $Z = \pi(\mathcal{Z}) \cap U$. The case $d \geq r$ is trivial as Z is precisely the hypersurfaces containing a line, so we only consider when $d < r$.

Let $\mathcal{F}^\circ_{r,d} \subset \mathcal{F}_{r,d}$ denote the open subset of tuples (X, p) where p is a smooth point of X. If $d < r-1$, then part (1) of Proposition 5.2 shows the unique largest component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{F}^\circ_{r,d} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ is the pairs (X, p) where p is an Eckardt point of X. Part (2) of Proposition 5.4 shows $\mathcal{C}$ is generically injective onto its image under π. Part (2) of Proposition 5.3 shows $\pi(\mathcal{C}) \cap U$ is nonempty, so $\pi(\mathcal{C}) \cap U$ is also the largest component of Z.

If $d = r-1$, then part (2) of Proposition 5.2 shows the largest and second largest components $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ of $\mathcal{F}^\circ_{r,d} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ are respectively the points (X, p) such that X contains a 2-plane containing p and the points (X, p) where p is an Eckardt point of X. Furthermore, we can directly compute $\dim(\mathcal{C}_1) - \dim(\mathcal{C}_2) = r - 3$. As before, $\mathcal{C}_2$ is generically injective onto its image under π and $\pi(\mathcal{C}_2) \cap U$ is nonempty. Part (1) of Proposition 5.4 shows $\mathcal{C}_1$ maps onto its image with 2-dimensional fibers and part (1) of Proposition 5.3 shows $\pi(\mathcal{C}_1) \cap U$ is nonempty for $r \geq 5$. □

To prove Theorem 5.1, we first need to understand what happens on the universal hypersurface.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose $r \geq d+1$ and $d \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to W_{r,d}$ be the universal hypersurface, where $W_{r,d} \cong \mathbb{A}^{\binom{r+d}{r}}$ parameterizes hypersurfaces of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^r$. Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{F}_{r,d}$ be the locus where the fiber of $F_{0,1}(\mathcal{F}_{r,d}/W_{r,d}) \to F_{r,d}$ is greater than $r-1-d$. The largest component of $\mathcal{Z}$ is the locus of points $(X, p) \in \mathcal{F}_{r,d} \subset W_{r,d} \times \mathbb{P}^r$ of $\mathcal{F}_{r,d}$ where p is a singular point of X. More importantly,*

(1) for $d < r-1$, the unique second largest component is the points (X, p) where p is an Eckardt point of X
(2) for $d = r-1$, the unique second and third largest components are
  (a) the points (X, p) where X contains a plane through p
  (b) the points (X, p) where p is an Eckardt point of X

Proof. Fix $p \in \mathbb{P}^r$ and note the fiber over p of the projection $\pi : \mathcal{F}_{r,d} \to \mathbb{P}^r$ is a hyperplane $\pi^{-1}(p) \subset W_{r,d}$. Let $\pi^{-1}(p) \cap \mathcal{Z}$ be Z_p. We see $Z_p \subset W_{r,d}$ is some closed subset. Given a hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ of degree d through p given by a homogeous polynomial F of degree d, we can take an affine chart $p \in \mathbb{A}^n$ where p is the origin, and expand $F = F_1 + \cdots + F_d$ around p. Here, F_i is the degree i part of F once we restrict to $\mathbb{A}^n$. Lines through p in $\mathbb{P}^r$ are parameterized by $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}$, and the lines through p in X are given by $\{F_1 = \cdots = F_d = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}$. See the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [9] for more details and an approach that behaves better as we vary p.

Since specifying the Taylor expansion $(F_1, \ldots, F_d)$ of F around a point p is equivalent to specifying F, $Z_p \cong \Phi^{r-1,1}_{1,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1})$. The locus where F_1 is identically zero corresponds to a choice of hypersurface X through p that is singular at p, and this happens in codimension r. If we assume F_1 is not zero, then we want to restrict to the hyperplane cut out by F_1. Take the open $U \subset \Phi^{r-1,1}_{1,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1})$ of tuples $(F_1, \ldots, F_d)$ where $F_1 \neq 0$. There is a map $U \to (\mathbb{P}^{r-1})^*$ given by $(F_1, \ldots, F_d)$ mapping to F_1. Each fiber is isomorphic to

$$\Phi^{r-2,1}_{2,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1}) \times \prod_{i=2}^{d} W_{r-1,i}/W_{r-2,i}.$$

If $d < r-1$, by Proposition 5.6, we find the largest component of $\Phi^{r-2,1}_{2,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1})$ is when the quadric is identically zero, which corresponds to when F_2 restricted to F_1 is zero. Equivalently, p being an Eckardt point of X.

If $d = r-1$, by Proposition 5.5, we find the largest component of $\Phi^{r-2,1}_{2,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1})$ is when $(F_2, \ldots, F_d)$ all contain a line lying in F_1, which is equivalent to X containing a plane through p. By Proposition 5.5, the unique second largest component of $\Phi^{r-2,1}_{2,\ldots,d}(\mathbb{P}^{r-1})$ is when the quadric is zero, which corresponds to the case where p is an Eckardt point of X. □

To derive Theorem 5.1 from Proposition 5.2, we require facts about hypersurfaces that are tedious but easy to check. In characteristic 0, many of these statements are immediate, as smooth hypersurfaces all have finitely many Eckardt points (see the discussion under Corollary 2.2 in [6]) and the Fermat hypersurface $\{X_0^d + \cdots + X_r^d = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ contains Eckardt points and planes, and is smooth when the characteristic does not divide d.

Lemma 5.3. *The following hold independently of the characteristic of our algebraically closed base field K.*

1. *There exists a smooth hypersurface of degree $d > 1$ in $\mathbb{P}^r$ containing a plane if and only if $r \geq 5$.*
2. *For $r \geq 2$ and $d \geq 2$, there exists a smooth hypersurface X of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^r$ and a hyperplane H such that $X \cap H$ is a cone in $H \cong \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$.*

Proof. We know that if $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is a smooth hypersurface of degree $d > 1$ contains a linear space Λ of dimension m, then $r \geq 2m+1$, for example from Proposition 1 in the Appendix of [3]. For the remaining part of each of these three statements, the method of proof is the same.

For example, suppose we wanted to prove (2). Let $V \subset W_{r,d}$ be the linear subspace of forms whose expansion around $[1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$ in the affine chart $X_0 \neq 0$ is of the form $f_0 + f_1 + \cdots + f_d$, where $f_0 = 0$ and $x_1 | f_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d-1$. Here, $x_1 := \frac{X_1}{X_0}$ is one of

the coordinates after dehomogenization. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset V \times \mathbb{P}^r$ be the incidence correspondence of pairs (F, p), where $F \in V$ and $p \in \{F = 0\}$ is a singular point. Here, our convention is that the zero hypersurface is singular at every point.

Consider the fiber of the map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{P}^r$. If $p \notin \{X_1 = 0\}$, then we can assume that $p = [0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$. We want to check that the $r + 1$ conditions being singular at p imposes on $W_{r,d}$ also imposes $r + 1$ conditions on V. If we let I denote a multi-index, a general element in $W_{r,d}$ can be written as $\sum_I c_I X^I$ and V is cut out by the conditions that $c_I = 0$ for all monomials X^I divisible by X_0 but not X_1. Being singular at p imposes the conditions that $c_I = 0$ for X_1^{d-1} dividing X^I. Since $d > 1$, these impose $r + 1$ independent conditions on V.

Suppose now $p \in \{X_1 = 0\}$, but $p \neq [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$, then we can assume $p = [0 : \cdots : 0 : 1]$, in which case being singular at p imposes r conditions on V. If $p = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$, then being singular at p imposes 1 condition on V. Combining the three cases, we see $\dim(\mathcal{X}) = \max\{\dim(V) - 1, \dim(V) - 1, \dim(V) - 1\}$, so the projection $\mathcal{X} \to V$ cannot be surjective. □

Lemma 5.4. *The following hold independently of the characteristic of our algebraically closed base field K.*

1. *If $\binom{d+2}{2} > 3(r-2)$, then a general hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ of degree d does not contain a plane, and a general hypersurface containing a plane contains exactly one plane.*
2. *If $d \geq 3$ and $r \geq 3$, then a general hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ of degree d containing an Eckardt point contains only one Eckardt point.*

Proof. The proof strategy is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.3. For example, suppose we wanted to prove (3). We can consider the incidence correspondence $\mathcal{I} \subset W_{r,d} \times (\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r$ consisting of triples (F, H, p) such that $p \in H$ and F restricted to H vanishes at p up to third order. By considering the projection onto $(\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r$, we see

$$\dim(\mathcal{I}) = \dim(W_{r,d}) - \binom{r+1}{2} + (2r - 1).$$

We can also consider the incidence correspondence $\mathcal{J} \subset W_{r,d} \times (\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r \times (\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r$ consisting of tuples (F, H_1, p_1, H_2, p_2) such that $p_1 \neq p_2$, $p_i \in H_i$, and F restricted to H_i vanishes at p_i up to third order.

To see the projection $\mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{I}$ is not surjective, it suffices to show $\dim(\mathcal{J}) < \dim(\mathcal{I})$. This type of analysis is also described at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [5]. They assume characteristic zero throughout the paper, but the assumption on characteristic is not used here. The idea is that the image of $\mathcal{J}$ in $(\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r \times (\mathbb{P}^r)^* \times \mathbb{P}^r$ decomposes into the following $\mathbb{P}GL(r + 1)$-orbits:

1. $p_1 \notin H_2, p_2 \notin H_1$
2. $p_1 \in H_2, p_2 \notin H_1$ (and similarly the locus obtained by interchanging the indices 1 and 2)
3. $p_1 \in H_2, p_2 \in H_1$ but $H_1 \neq H_2$
4. $H_1 = H_2$, $p_1 \neq p_2$.

We will do case (3), because it seemed the most worrisome to us. Without loss of generality, we can assume $p_1 = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$, $H_1 = \{X_1 = 0\}$, $p_2 = [0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$,

$H_2 = \{X_3 = 0\}$. Then, the fiber of $\mathcal{J}$ over (p_1, H_1, p_2, H_3) consists of the polynomials $\sum_I c_I X^I$ such that if

(a) X_0^{d-2} divides X^I but X_1 does not or
(b) X_2^{d-2} divides X^I but X_3 does not

then $c_I = 0$. Each case gives $\binom{r+1}{2}$ conditions, but there might be overlapping conditions. The number of overlapping conditions is maximized for $d = 3$, where it is $r - 1$. So part of $\mathcal{J}$ lying above the locus in case (3) has dimension

$$\dim(W_{r,d}) - \left(2\binom{r+1}{2} - (r-1)\right) + (2r + 2(r-2)).$$

Subtracting this from $\dim(\mathcal{I})$ yields $\binom{r}{2} - 2r + 4 = (r-1)(\frac{r}{2} - 2 + \frac{2}{r-1})$, which is positive for $r \geq 2$. The condition that $r \geq 3$ comes from the part of $\mathcal{J}$ lying over case (1), and this is clearly necessary as the case $r = 2$ corresponds to plane curves and Eckardt points are flex points. □

5.1. **Application of filtration by span.**

Proposition 5.5. *The component of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ of largest dimension is the component of hypersurfaces all containing a line which is of codimension $\frac{r^2+r+4}{2}$. For $r \geq 2$, the unique second largest component of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is the locus of tuples of hypersurfaces $(F_1, \dots, F_r)$ where F_1 is identically zero, which has codimension $\binom{r+2}{2}$.*

Proof. The largest component of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ can be identified by applying Theorem 4.6. To find the second largest component, we see that Theorem 4.6 also says the difference between the dimensions of the largest and second largest components of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is at least $r-1$. Since

$$\binom{r+2}{2} - (\frac{r(r+5)}{2} - 2(r-1)) = r - 1,$$

we see that the locus of tuples of hypersurfaces $(F_1, \dots, F_r)$ where F_1 is identically zero is a component of second largest dimension. To finish, we need to show uniqueness. Let $Z \subset \Phi^{r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ be a component of second highest dimension. From the proof of Theorem 4.6, we know that if

$$\dim(Z) = \dim(Z \cap \Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathrm{Span}(b)),$$

then $b = 2$ or $b = r$. If $r > 2$, we can rule out the case $b = 2$ directly, as Lemma 4.4 implies $\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathrm{Span}(b))) \geq G_{r,r-1,2}(2, \dots, r+1)$, and it is easy to check $G_{r,r-1,2}(2, \dots, r+1)$ achieves its minimum at the choice of indices $1 < 3 < 4 < \cdots < r$, so

$$\mathrm{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\dots,r+1}(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathrm{Span}(b))) \geq 6 + \sum_{i=3}^{r}(2i+1) = r^2 + 2r - 2,$$

which is greater than $\binom{r+2}{2}$ for $r > 2$. To finish, it suffices to show that

$$h_{r,r-i+1}(1+i) = (i-1)\binom{r+1}{i} + \binom{r+2}{i+1}$$

achieves its unique minimum at $i = 1$ over $1 \leq i \leq r$. By looking at the second term, we see that it suffices to compare the cases when $i = 1$ and $i = r$, and we see

$$(r-1)(r+1) + (r+2) - \binom{r+2}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(r^2 - r)$$

which is greater than zero when $r > 1$. □

Proposition 5.6 is an example where we apply Theorem 4.5 to a case where the hypersurfaces all contain a surface rather than a curve. This will be easier than Proposition 5.5, as we can make cruder approximations.

Proposition 5.6. *The unique component of $\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\ldots,r}(\mathbb{P}^r)$ of largest dimension is the locus of tuples $(F_1, \ldots, F_{r-1})$ of degrees $(2, \ldots, r)$ such that $F_1 = 0$.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 4.4, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,1}_{2,\ldots,r}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(b))) &\geq \sum_{i=b+2}^{r+2} \binom{i}{2} - (b+1)(r-b) \\ &\geq \binom{r+3}{3} - \binom{b+2}{3} - (b+1)(r-b),\end{aligned}$$

and equality holds when $b = r$. Let $A(b, r) := \binom{r+3}{3} - \binom{b+2}{3} - (b+1)(r-b)$. Taking the difference $A(r, b) - A(1, b)$, we get

$$-\frac{1}{6}(b-r)(b^2 + br - 3b + r^2 + 3r - 4).$$

Since $b^2 + br - 3b + r^2 + 3r - 4 > 0$ for $b < r$, we only have to deal with the case $b = r$. In this case, we see that $h_{r,r-i+1}(1+i)$ achieves its unique minimum at $i = 1$ over $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, as in the proof of Proposition 5.5. □

Lemma 5.7. *We have*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{2,\ldots,r+a-1}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r))) \geq \binom{r+2}{2} + \binom{r+3}{2} + \cdots + \binom{r+a+1}{2}.$$

Proof. We want to apply Lemma 4.3. However, instead of trying to determine the minimum, we can crudely approximate

$$\begin{aligned}F_{r,a}(2, \ldots, r+a-1) = \min\{\sum_{j=1}^{a} (i_j - j)\binom{(i_j+1) + (r-i_j+j) - 1}{i_j} + \binom{(i_j+1) + (r-i_j+j)}{i_j+1} \\ : S = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_a\} \subset \{1, \ldots, r+a-2\}, i_1 < \cdots < i_a\}\end{aligned}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned}&\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{a} \binom{(i_j+1) + (r-i_j+j)}{i_j+1} : S = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_a\} \subset \{1, \ldots, r+a-2\}, i_1 < \cdots < i_a\} \quad = \\ &\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{a} \binom{1+r+j}{i_j+1} : S = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_a\} \subset \{1, \ldots, r+a-2\}, i_1 < \cdots < i_a\} \quad .\end{aligned}$$

Since $i_j \leq (r+a-2)-(a-j) = r+j-2$, $\binom{1+r+j}{i_j+1} \leq \binom{1+r+j}{2}$. Therefore, the sum is bounded below by

$$\binom{r+2}{2} + \binom{r+3}{2} + \cdots + \binom{r+a+1}{2}.$$

□

6. Application: Hypersurfaces singular along a curve

We want to show, among the hypersurfaces with positive dimensional singular locus, the component of largest dimension consists of the hypersurfaces singular along a line. To prove this in characteristic 0, it will suffice to prove it in characteristic p for one choice of p by an application of upper semicontinuity. We will chose $p = 2$ because it gives us the best bounds.

The obstacle to directly applying our general argument to the problem at hand is that the partial derivatives ∂_{X_i} of a degree ℓ form F do not vary independently as we vary F in $W_{r,\ell}$. However, the key trick is given in [13] and used in [15] to resolve this problem. Let K be characteristic 2 and for simplicity suppose $\ell = 2d+1$ is odd. Then, when choosing our degree ℓ form F, we can add independent fudge factors $G_0, \ldots, G_r$, which are forms of degree d, and take the sum

$$F + X_0 G_0^2 + \cdots + X_r G_r^2,$$

so $\partial_{X_i}(F + X_0 G_0^2 + \cdots + X_r G_r^2) = \partial_{X_i} F + G_i^2$. At least optically, it looks like the partial derivatives are more independent, and we will reproduce same the argument Slavov used in [15] to reduce the problem of when $F + X_0 G_0^2 + \cdots + X_r G_r^2$ is singular along a curve to the problem of when the fudge factors G_i all contain the same curve. As a technical remark, we need to consider the case of hypersurfaces singular along a rational normal curve separately because the bounds given by Theorem 4.5 were slightly too weak. Once we remove the locus of all the G_i's containing a rational normal curve, we can repeat the proof of Theorem 4.5 to get slightly better bounds that will suffice.

6.1. **Reduction to characteristic 2.** We will follow section 3.1 in [15]. Fix a degree $\ell \geq 3$ and dimension $r \geq 2$. Let $W_{\mathbb{Z}} := \mathbb{Z}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_\ell$. The notation $W_{r,\ell,\mathbb{Z}}$ would be more consistent with Definition 3.7, but we drop ℓ and r from the notation because they are fixed. Over the $\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$-scheme $W_{\mathbb{Z}} \cong \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\binom{r+\ell}{\ell}}$, we can construct a scheme $\mathscr{S} \subset W_{\mathbb{Z}} \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})} \mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathbb{P}^r_{W_{\mathbb{Z}}}$, where over each point $\operatorname{Spec}(K) \to W_{\mathbb{Z}}$ corresponding to a homogenous polynomial F over K, the fiber $\mathscr{S} \times_{\mathbb{P}W_{\mathbb{Z}}} \operatorname{Spec}(K)$ is the subscheme of $\mathbb{P}^r_K$ cut out by $(F, \partial_{X_0} F, \ldots, \partial_{X_r} F)$.

By applying upper semicontinuity of fiber dimension, we can filter $\mathbb{P}W_{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathcal{S}_{-1} \supset \mathcal{S}_0 \supset \mathcal{S}_1 \cdots \supset \mathcal{S}_i \supset$, where $\mathcal{S}_i$ is the closed subset over which the fiber of $\mathscr{S}$ has dimension at least i. Put another way, $\mathcal{S}_i$ is the hypersurfaces that are singular along a subvariety of dimension at least i.

Definition 6.1. Given ℓ and r as above, let $\mathcal{S}_i \subset W_{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the locus of hypersurfaces that have a singular locus of dimension at least i. Let $\mathcal{S}_{i,K}$ denote $\mathcal{S}_i \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})} \operatorname{Spec}(K)$ for a point $\operatorname{Spec}(K) \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 6.2. We let $\mathcal{S}_i^1 \subset \mathcal{S}_i$, where $\mathcal{S}_i^1$ is the locus of hypersurfaces singular along a dimension i plane. As before, we let $\mathcal{S}_{i,K}^1$ denote the base change of $\mathcal{S}_i^1$ to a field K.

Recall:

Theorem 6.1 ([15, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Fix i, r, p. Then, there is an effectively computable ℓ_0 in terms of i, r, p such that $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{i,K}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{i,K} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{i,K})$ for $\ell > \ell_0$ and all fields K of characteristic p.*

Roughly, the proof of Theorem 6.1 bounds $\mathcal{S}_{i,K}$ by dividing based on the degree of the variety contained in the singular locus and has separate argument for the cases of low degree and high degree. We will just use the argument from the high degree case for hypersurfaces singular along any curve other than a line.

In order to keep our statements clean, we will restrict ourselves to the case $i = 1$ and the case our base field has characteristic 0. We want to show $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{i,K}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{i,K} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{i,K})$. Recall:

Proposition 6.2 ([15, Lemma 5.1])**.** *We have $\operatorname{codim}(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}) = \ell r - 2r + 3$ for all fields K.*

Now, we want to apply upper semicontinuity to show that $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}})$ implies $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$. In fact, if we just wanted $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}) \geq \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}})$, this would follow from upper semicontinuity of fiber dimension applied to $\overline{\mathcal{S}_1 \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_1}$. As it stands, we have to worry about the case where a component of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_1 \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_1}$ is distinct from $\mathcal{S}^1_1$ over the generic fiber, but limits to $\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ over the prime 2.

Lemma 6.3. *If p is a prime and $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}})$, then $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,K} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,K})$ for algebraically closed fields of almost all characteristics, including characteristic zero.*

Proof. Consider the incidence correspondence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1 & \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_1}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \pi_2} \\ \mathcal{S}^1 & & \overline{\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}}} \end{array}$$

where $\operatorname{Hilb}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}}$ is the Hilbert scheme of curves in $\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\overline{\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}}}$ is the closure of the open sublocus consisting of integral curves. Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1$ consists of pairs $(F, [C])$ of a degree ℓ form F and a curve C such that the partial derivatives of F vanish on C. More precisely, we can apply Lemma 3.2 to the universal family over $\overline{\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}}}$ and to the family $\mathcal{S}_1 \to W_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

By definition, $\mathcal{S}^1_1 = \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\mathbb{G}(1, r))$. Let $\mathcal{S}^2_1 := \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\overline{\widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r_{\mathbb{Z}}}} \backslash \mathbb{G}(1, r))$ be the degree ℓ forms whose corresponding hypersurfaces are singular along a curve of degree greater than 1. Crucially, $\mathcal{S}^2_1$ contains, for example, hypersurfaces singular along a scheme supported on a line with multiplicity 2. Since $\mathcal{S}^2_1$ is closed, $\mathcal{S}^2_1 \supset \overline{\mathcal{S}_1 \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_1}$.

Claim 6.4. *For any field K, $\mathcal{S}^2_{1,K} := \mathcal{S}^2_1 \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})} \operatorname{Spec}(K)$ does not contain $\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}$.*

First, if we assume Claim 6.4, then Lemma 6.3 follows from upper semicontinuity applied to $\mathcal{S}^2_1 \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$ as the fiber dimensions of $\mathcal{S}^1_1 \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$ are constant by Proposition 6.2 and $\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}$ is irreducible for all K. To show Claim 6.4, it suffices to find a single polynomial $F \in K[X_0, \ldots, X_r]$ of degree ℓ such that the ideal generated by $(\partial_{X_0} F, \ldots, \partial_{X_r} F)$ scheme theoretically cuts out a curve in $\mathbb{P}^r$ of degree 1, so Claim 6.5 suffices.

Claim 6.5. *Fix a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^r_K$ and let $V \subset W_{\mathbb{Z}} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})} \mathrm{Spec}(K)$ be the subvector space of degree ℓ forms over K that are singular along L. Then, there is a dense open $U \subset V$ consisting of degree ℓ forms F whose partial derivatives $(\partial_{X_0}F, \ldots, \partial_{X_r}F)$ scheme theoretically cut out a curve of degree 1.*

To see Claim 6.5, we first note Lemma 7.4 in [15] shows there is a dense open subset $U_1 \subset V$ consisting of forms F whose partial derivatives cut out L set-theoretically. (Lemma 7.4 in [15] assumes $\ell \geq 3$, though the case $\ell = 2$ is also true, for example from the proof of Claim 6.6 below.) We now focus our attention around L. Let $\mathcal{I}_L$ be the ideal sheaf of the line L and $L' \supset L$ be the scheme cut out by $\mathcal{I}_L^2$. Let $X \to V$ be the family $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r \times V$, where each fiber of X over $[F] \in V$ is the scheme cut out in $\mathbb{P}^r_K$ by the partials $(\partial_{X_0}F, \ldots, \partial_{X_r}F)$. (In the notation at the beginning of section 6.1, X is $(\mathscr{S} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})} \mathrm{Spec}(K))|_V$.)

We consider the intersection $X \cap (L' \times_K V)$ and apply upper semicontinuity of degree to the family $X \cap (L' \times_K V) \to V$ to see the locus $U_2 \subset V$ over which each fiber of $X \cap (L' \times_K V) \to V$ is degree 1 is open in V. To get upper semicontinuity of degree of $X \cap (L' \times_K V) \to V$, we are using that each fiber is of the same dimension. To prove it in our case, for $p \in V$ and slice $X \cap (L' \times_K V)$ by a general hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ such that $X|_p \cap H$ has length equal to $\deg(X|_p)$. Then, since H cannot contain the support of L, $X \cap (H \cap L' \times_K V) \to V$ is a finite morphism, and we can apply upper semicontinuity of rank of a coherent sheaf to the pushforward of the structure sheaf of $X \cap (H \cap L' \times_K V)$ to V to conclude.

Finally, if we knew U_2 were nonempty, then $U_1 \cap U_2$ would satisfy the conditions of Claim 6.5.

Claim 6.6. *The set $U_2 \subset V$ is nonempty.*

Without loss of generality, suppose the ideal sheaf of L is generated by $(X_0, \ldots, X_{r-2})$. If $r \geq 3$ and Q is a degree 2 form in $X_0, \ldots, X_{r-2}$ that cuts out a smooth quadric in $\mathbb{P}^{r-2}$. Here, we are using the fact that we can assume K is algebraically closed. Since the partial derivatives of Q are linear, the partial derivatives of Q generate $(X_0, \ldots, X_{r-2})$ exactly. If we consider Q as a form in $X_0, \ldots, X_r$ that ignores the last two varibles, the partial derivatives of Q generate exactly the ideal sheaf of a line. If $r = 2$, we let Q be the doubled line.

If $\ell = 2$, then we are done. Otherwise, pick general linear forms $H_1, \ldots, H_{\ell-2}$ that all intersect L properly. Then, the product $QH_1 \cdots H_{\ell-2}$ is in U_2. □

From Theorems 6.20 and 6.21, we have:

Theorem 6.7. *For $\ell \geq 7$ or $\ell = 5$, $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}})$, so in particular $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,K} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,K})$ for algebraically closed fields K of characteristic 0 or of characteristic p for all but finitely many p.*

6.2. **Counting in characteristic p.** We will use a clever trick first given in [13] and then used in [15]. To apply this trick, we need the Lang-Weil estimate to relate counting rational points in characteristic p to dimension. Recall:

Theorem 6.8 ([11, Theorem 1])**.** *Suppose $V \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ is an irreducible projective variety defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Then, if $\#V(\mathbb{F}_{q^c})$ is the number of $\mathbb{F}_{q^c}$ rational points of V,*

$$|\#V(\mathbb{F}_{q^c}) - q^{\dim(V)}| \leq \delta q^{\dim(V)-\frac{1}{2}} + A(r, \dim(V), \deg(V))q^{r-1},$$

where $\delta = (\deg(V) - 1)(\deg(V) - 2)$ and A is a function of $\dim(V)$, $\deg(V)$ and r.

We rephrase Theorem 6.8 in a weaker form that is easier to apply.

Lemma 6.9. *If X is a quasiprojective variety defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $Y \subset X$ is a constructible set, then the codimension of Y in X is greater than A if and only if*

$$\lim_{c\to\infty} q^{cA}\text{Prob}(x \in Y(\mathbb{F}_{q^c})) := \lim_{c\to\infty} q^{cA}\frac{\#Y(\mathbb{F}_{q^c})}{\#X(\mathbb{F}_{q^c})} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a locally closed embedding and $\overline{X}$ be its closure in projective space. Then, $\#X(\mathbb{F}_{q^c}) = \Theta(q^{c\dim(X)})$, as $\dim(\overline{X}\backslash X) < \dim(X)$ and we can apply Theorem 6.8 to every irreducible component of $\overline{X}$ and of $\overline{X}\backslash X$.

Let $Y^\circ \subset Y \subset \overline{Y}$, where Y° is a quasiprojective variety contained in Y and $\overline{Y}$ is the closure of Y in $\overline{X}$. By applying Theorem 6.8 to each irreducible component of $\overline{Y}$ and to each irreducible component of $\overline{Y}\backslash Y^\circ$, we find $\#Y(\mathbb{F}_{q^c}) = \Theta(q^{c\dim(Y)})$. □

See Lemma 6.3 in [15] for a slightly more general version of Lemmas 6.10 and 6.11.

Lemma 6.10. *Let ℓ be odd. Fix a reduced scheme $V \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ for q a power of 2. If we fix $G \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\ell-1}$ and pick $G_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell-1}{2}}$ randomly then*

$$\text{Prob}(G + G_0^2 \supset V) \leq \text{Prob}(G_0 \supset V).$$

Lemma 6.11. *Let ℓ be even. Fix a reduced scheme $V \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ for q a power of 2 and with no component contained in the hyperplane $\{X_0 = 0\}$. If we fix $G \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\ell-1}$ and pick $G_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell}{2}-1}$ randomly then*

$$\text{Prob}(G + X_0G_0^2 \supset V) \leq \text{Prob}(G_0 \supset V).$$

Proof. Since the proofs of Lemma 6.10 and Lemma 6.11 are exactly the same, we will prove Lemma 6.11. We will show equality holds if $\text{Prob}(G+G_0^2 \supset V) > 0$. Suppose $\text{Prob}(G+G_0^2 \supset V) > 0$. Fix $G_1 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell-1}{2}}$ such that $G + X_0G_1^2 \supset V$. Then, for every other choice $G_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell}{2}-1}$ such that $G+X_0G_0 \supset V$, we see that $X_0G_0^2 - X_0G_1^2 = X_0(G_0-G_1)^2$ contains V. Since V reduced and $\{X_0 = 0\}$ does not contain a component of V, X_0 restricts to a nonzero divisor on V and $G_0 - G_1 \supset V$. Thus, the map

$$\{G_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell}{2}-1} | G + X_0G_0^2 \supset V\} \to \{G_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\dots,X_r]_{\frac{\ell}{2}-1} | G_0 \supset V\}$$

that sends G_0 to $G_0 - G_1$ is a bijection. Put another way, the first set is a torsor under the action of the second set under addition. □

6.3. **Case of plane curves.** The case of plane curves, so hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^r$ for $r = 2$, is easy because everything can be computed explicitly. However, in the proof of Theorem 6.20 and 6.21, our bounds will improve with increasing r, so it is helpful to be able to assume $r \geq 3$. It is an easy dimension computation to see:

Proposition 6.12. *For curves in $\mathbb{P}^2$, $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,K}\backslash\mathcal{S}^1_{1,K})$ for all fields K and all degrees ℓ.*

6.4. **Hypersurfaces singular along a rational normal curve.** We will need to know the number of conditions it is to be singular along a fixed rational normal curve of degree r in $\mathbb{P}^r$. We will use:

Lemma 6.13 ([4, Proposition 8])**.** *If $\ell \geq 3$, $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^r$ is a fixed rational normal curve of degree r, and $V \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell))$ is the vector space of degree ℓ forms singular along C, then V is codimension $r^2(\ell+1) - 2(r^2-1)$.*

Remark 4. *Even though Conca* [4] *assumes $r \geq 3$ throughout, the case $r = 1, 2$ can be done directly. The codimension of V is bounded by the Hilbert polynomial of $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C^2$, where $\mathcal{I}_C$ is the ideal sheaf of C. To see this, we consider the short exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2 \to \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C^2 \to \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C \to 0.$$

We see that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell))$ is 0 as $H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C(\ell)) \cong H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r\ell)) = 0$ and $H^1(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)) = H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r\ell - r - 2))^{r-1} = 0$. The content of Lemma 6.13 is that for $\ell \geq 3$, the maximum is achieved.

Lemma 6.14. *If $\ell \geq 3$, $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^r$ is a fixed rational normal curve of degree $r \geq 3$, $\mathbb{P}^r \subset \mathbb{P}^{r+a}$ is embedded as a linear subspace, $V \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^{r+a}, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r+a}}(\ell))$ is the vector space of degree ℓ forms singular along C, then V is codimension $r^2(\ell+1) - 2(r^2-1) + a(r(\ell-1)+1)$.*

Proof. Since C is a local complete intersection, from the introduction of [16], it suffices to find the Hilbert function of $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r+a}}/\mathcal{I}_C^2$. First, we see that $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r+a}}/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)$ has no higher cohomology from the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2 \to \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C^2 \to \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C \to 0,$$

from which we see $H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell))$ is 0 as $H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}/\mathcal{I}_C(\ell)) \cong H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r\ell)) = 0$ and $H^1(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)) = H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r\ell - r - 2))^{r-1} \oplus H^1(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r\ell - 1))^a = 0$.

Let $V' \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^{r+a}, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r+a}}(\ell))$ be the subspace of forms vanishing on C. There is an induced map $V' \to H^0(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell))$. Since C is projectively normal, it suffices to show that the map $V' \to H^0(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)) = H^0(N^\vee_{C/\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell)) \oplus H^0(\mathscr{O}_C(\ell-1))^a$ is surjective.

Given a form $F(X_0, \ldots, X_{r+a})$ vanishing on C, we can write it as

$$F = G(X_0, \ldots, X_r) + G_1(X_0, \ldots, X_{r+a})X_{r+1} + \cdots G_a(X_0, \ldots, X_{r+a})X_{r+a}.$$

The map $V' \to H^0(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)) = H^0(N^\vee_{C/\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell)) \oplus H^0(\mathscr{O}_C(\ell-1))^a$ sends F to

$$(G|_{N^\vee_{C/\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell)}, G_1|_{\mathscr{O}_C(\ell-1)}, \ldots, G_a|_{\mathscr{O}_C(\ell-1)}).$$

Since the map $V' \to H^0(N^\vee_{C/\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell)) \cong H^0(\mathscr{O}_{P^1}(-r-2+\ell r))^{r-1}$ is surjective from Lemma 6.14, and the G_i's can be chosen independently, we see that $V' \to H^0(\mathcal{I}_C/\mathcal{I}_C^2(\ell)) = H^0(N^\vee_{C/\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell)) \oplus H^0(\mathscr{O}_C(\ell-1))^a$ is surjective. □

Lemma 6.15. *Let $T_i' \subset H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(\ell))$ be the locus of hypersurfaces singular along some degree i rational normal curve. Then,* $\operatorname{codim}(T_i') \geq i(\ell r - 2r - 2) + 5$ *and equality holds when $i = 1$.*

Proof. From Lemma 6.14, the number of conditions it is to be singular along a rational normal curve of degree i is

$$i^2(\ell+1) - 2(i^2-1) + (r-i)(i(\ell-1)+1).$$

The moduli of rational normal curves of degree i in $\mathbb{P}^r$ is $(i+3)(i-1)+(i+1)(r-i)$, so

$$\operatorname{codim}(T_i') \geq i^2(\ell+1) - 2(i^2-1) + (r-i)(i(\ell-1)+1) - (i+3)(i-1) - (i+1)(r-i)$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(T_i') \geq i(\ell r - 2r - 2) + 5.$$

Equality holds when $i=1$ from Lemma 5.1 in [15]. □

6.5. **Hypersurfaces containing a nondegenerate curve.** We need to repeat the proofs for Lemmas 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 but we want to remove rational normal curves from our set of curves.

Definition 6.3. Let $\operatorname{Span}(b)' \subset \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r}$ denote the integral curves whose span is exactly a b-dimensional plane except for the rational normal curves of degree b.

From a special case of Theorem 4.5 in [12], we have

Lemma 6.16. *We have*

$$h_{\operatorname{Span}(b)' \cap \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r}}(d) \geq (b+1)d.$$

From iterating Lemma 3.3 together and applying 6.16, we find

Lemma 6.17. *For $r-k+a=1$, we have $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X, \operatorname{Span}(r)')) \geq a(r+1)d$ for $d_1 = \cdots = d_k = d$.*

Proof. It suffices to show $h_{\operatorname{Span}(r)' \cap \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^1_{\mathbb{P}^r}}(d) \leq h_{\operatorname{Span}(r) \cap \widetilde{\operatorname{Hilb}}^2_{\mathbb{P}^r}}(d)$ for all d. Equivalently,

$$(r-2)\binom{d+1}{2} + \binom{d+2}{2} \geq (r+1)d = (r-1)\binom{d}{1} + \binom{d+1}{1} + (d-1)$$
$$(r-1)\binom{d}{2} + \binom{d+1}{2} - \binom{d+1}{2} \geq d-1$$
$$(r-1)\frac{d}{2}(d-1) \geq d-1,$$

which is true when $d \geq 2$. □

Similarly, applying Lemma 3.4 and following the same proof as Lemma 4.4, we get

Lemma 6.18. *For $r-k+a=1$,*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(b)')) \geq \operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^b,a+(r-b)}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(\mathbb{P}^b, \operatorname{Span}(b)')) - \dim(\mathbb{G}(b,r)).$$

Combining Lemmas 6.17 and Lemma 6.18, we get

Lemma 6.19. *For $r-k+a=1$, we have*

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,a}_{d_1,\dots,d_k}(X, \operatorname{Span}(b)')) \geq (a+r-b)(b+1)d - \dim(\mathbb{G}(b,r))$$

for $d_1 = \cdots = d_k = d$.

6.6. **Case of odd degree.** The argument is the same in both cases, but it is cleaner in the case where ℓ is odd which yields slightly better bounds.

Theorem 6.20. *For odd $\ell \geq 5$, $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}})$.*

Proof. From Proposition 6.12, we can assume $r \geq 3$. We cover $\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ by constructible sets:

(1) $T_1 = \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$
(2) $T_i \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ be the hypersurfaces singular along a degree i rational normal curve
(3) $T_i' \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ be the hypersurfaces singular along an integral curve spanning an i-dimensional plane other than the degree i rational normal curve

We will bound the codimensions of the sets T_i, T_i' for $2 \leq i \leq r$ separately.

Let $A = \operatorname{codim}(T_1) = \ell r - 2r + 3$. First, $\operatorname{codim}(T_i) > \operatorname{codim}(T_1)$ for $i > 1$, from Lemma 6.15 as $r, \ell \geq 3$ implies $\ell r - 2r - 2 > 0$.

We bound $\operatorname{codim}(T_i')$ for $2 \leq i \leq r$. Suppose we are selecting a hypersurface F randomly among $\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_\ell$. From Lemma 6.9, it suffices to show

$$\lim_{c\to\infty} 2^{cA}\operatorname{Prob}(F \in T_i') = 0.$$

In picking F, we could also have picked $(G, G_0, \ldots, G_r)$ from $\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_\ell \times (\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_{\frac{\ell-1}{2}})^{r+1}$ uniformly and let $F = G + X_0G_0^2 + \cdots + X_rG_r^2$.

Then, $\partial_i F = \partial_i G + G_i^2$. Let E_i be the condition that $\partial_i G + G_i^2$ all vanish on an integral curve spanning an i-dimensional plane other than the degree i rational normal curve. It suffices to show

$$\lim_{c\to\infty} 2^{cA}\operatorname{Prob}(E_i) = 0.$$

Let E_i' be the condition that $G_0, \ldots, G_r$ all contain an integral curve spanning an i-dimensional plane other than the degree i rational normal curve. From Lemma 6.10, it suffices to show

$$\lim_{c\to\infty} 2^{cA}\operatorname{Prob}(E_i') = 0.$$

Applying Lemma 6.9 again, it suffices to show

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) > A$$

for $d_1 = \cdots = d_{r+1} = d$. Applying Lemma 6.19, we see

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) \geq -(i+1)(r-i) + (r-i+2)((i+1)d)$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) \geq (1-d)i^2 + i(dr + d - r + 1) + dr + 2d - r$$

for $d_1 = \cdots = d_{r+1} = d$. Since this is quadratic in i with negative coefficient in front of i^2, it suffices to check the cases $i = 2$ and $i = r$. We see for $i = 2$,

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(2)')) \geq -3(r-2) + r(3d)$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(2)')) - A \geq dr - 2r + 3,$$

so $d \geq 2$ suffices. In the case $i = r$,

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r)')) \geq 2(r+1)d$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r)')) - A \geq r + 2d - 3,$$

so $d \geq 2$ suffices. □

6.7. **Case of even degree.**

Theorem 6.21. *For even $\ell \geq 8$, $\dim(\mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}) > \dim(\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}} \backslash \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}})$.*

Proof. From Proposition 6.12, we can assume $r \geq 3$. We cover $\mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ by constructible sets:

(1) $T_1 = \mathcal{S}^1_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$
(2) $T_i \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ be the hypersurfaces singular along a degree i rational normal curve
(3) $T'_{i,j,j'} \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,\overline{\mathbb{F}_2}}$ be the hypersurfaces singular an integral curve $C \ncong \mathbb{P}^1$ spanning an i dimensional plane and not contained in $\{X_j X_{j'} = 0\}$.

Since $\bigcap_{j \neq j'} \{X_j X_{j'} = 0\} = \{[1:0:\cdots:0], [0:1:\cdots:0], \ldots, [0:0:\cdots:1]\}$ is finite, it cannot contain any curves. We will bound the codimensions of the sets T_i, T'_i for $2 \leq i \leq r-2$ separately. Let $A = \operatorname{codim}(T_1) = \ell r - 2r + 3$.

First, $\operatorname{codim}(T_i) > \operatorname{codim}(T_1)$ for $i > 1$, from Lemma 6.15 as $r, \ell \geq 3$ implies $\ell r - 2r - 2 > 0$.

We bound $\operatorname{codim}(T'_{i,j,j'})$ for $2 \leq i \leq r$. By symmetry, it suffices to assume $j = 0, j' = 1$. Let $d = \frac{\ell}{2} - 1$. Suppose we select a hypersurface F randomly among $\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_\ell$. From Lemma 6.9, it suffices to show

$$\lim_{c \to \infty} 2^{cA} \operatorname{Prob}(F \in T_{i,j,j'} \backslash T'_i) = 0.$$

In picking F, we could also have picked $(G, G_0, \ldots, G_r)$ from $\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_\ell \times (\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_d)^{r+1}$ uniformly and let $F = G + X_1 X_0 G_0^2 + X_0(X_1 G_1^2 + \cdots + X_r G_r^2)$.

Then, $\partial_i F = \partial_i G + X_0 G_i^2$ for $i \neq 0$ and $\partial_0 F = \partial_i G + X_1 G_0^2$. Let $E_{i,0,1}$ be the condition that $\partial_i F$ all vanish along some integral curve $C \ncong \mathbb{P}^1$ spanning an i-dimensional plane and is not contained in $\{X_j X_{j'} = 0\}$.

It suffices to show

$$\lim_{c \to \infty} 2^{cA} \operatorname{Prob}(E_{i,0,1}) = 0.$$

Suppose we choose $G_0, \ldots, G_r$ from $(\mathbb{F}_{2^c}[X_0, \ldots, X_r]_d)^{r+1}$ uniformly. Let E'_i be the condition that they all contain some integral curve $C \ncong \mathbb{P}^1$ spanning an i-dimensional plane. By applying Lemma 6.11, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{c \to \infty} 2^{cA} \operatorname{Prob}(E'_i) = 0.$$

Applying Lemma 6.9 again, we see it suffices to show $\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) > A$. Applying Lemma 6.19, we see

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) \geq -(i+1)(r-i) + (r-i+2)((i+1)d)$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(i)')) \geq (1-d)i^2 + i(dr + d - r + 1) + dr + 2d - r$$

for $d_1 = \cdots = d_{r+1} = d$. Since this is quadratic in i with negative coefficient in front of i^2, it suffices to check the cases $i = 2$ and $i = r$. We see for $i = 2$,

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(2)')) \geq -3(r-2) + r(3d)$$
$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(2)')) - A \geq dr - 3r + 3,$$

so $d \geq 3$ suffices. In the case $i = r$,

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\ldots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r)')) \geq 2(r+1)d$$

$$\operatorname{codim}(\Phi^{\mathbb{P}^r,2}_{d_1,\dots,d_{r+1}}(\mathbb{P}^r, \operatorname{Span}(r)')) - A \geq 2d - 3,$$

so $d \geq 2$ suffices.

Putting everything together, we see that we need $d \geq 3$, so $\ell \geq 8$ suffices. □

7. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Joe Harris, Anand Patel, and Bjorn Poonen for helpful conversations.

References

[1] Enrico Arbarello, Maurizio Cornalba, and Phillip A. Griffiths. *Geometry of algebraic curves. Volume II*, volume 268 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. With a contribution by Joseph Daniel Harris.

[2] Roya Beheshti and N. Mohan Kumar. Spaces of rational curves on complete intersections. *Compos. Math.*, 149(6):1041–1060, 2013.

[3] T. D. Browning and D. R. Heath-Brown. The density of rational points on non-singular hypersurfaces. II. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 93(2):273–303, 2006. With an appendix by J. M. Starr.

[4] Aldo Conca. Hilbert function and resolution of the powers of the ideal of the rational normal curve. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 152(1-3):65–74, 2000. Commutative algebra, homological algebra and representation theory (Catania/Genoa/Rome, 1998).

[5] Izzet Coskun and Artie Prendergast-Smith. Eckardt loci on hypersurfaces. *Comm. Algebra*, 43(8):3083–3101, 2015.

[6] Izzet Coskun and Jason Starr. Rational curves on smooth cubic hypersurfaces. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (24):4626–4641, 2009.

[7] Jean Dieudonné and Alexander Grothendieck. Éléments de géométrie algébrique. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 4, 8, 11, 17, 20, 24, 28, 32, 1961–1967.

[8] William Fulton. *Intersection theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.

[9] Joe Harris, Mike Roth, and Jason Starr. Rational curves on hypersurfaces of low degree. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 571:73–106, 2004.

[10] János Kollár. *Rational curves on algebraic varieties*, volume 32 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[11] Serge Lang and Andre Weil. Number of points of varieties in finite fields. *Amer. J. Math.*, 76:819–827, 1954.

[12] Euisung Park. On hypersurfaces containing projective varieties. *Forum Math.*, 27(2):843–875, 2015.

[13] Bjorn Poonen. Bertini theorems over finite fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 160(3):1099–1127, 2004.

[14] E. Riedl and D. Yang. Kontsevich spaces of rational curves on fano hypersurfaces. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, forthcoming.

[15] Kaloyan Slavov. The moduli space of hypersurfaces whose singular locus has high dimension. *Math. Z.*, 279(1-2):139–162, 2015.

[16] Kaloyan Slavov. The Hilbert polynomial of a symbolic square. *Comm. Algebra*, 44(3):1265–1274, 2016.

Dennis Tseng, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

E-mail address: DennisCTseng@gmail.com